

Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT)
May 25, 2011
Final Meeting Notes

I. Participating Agencies /Attendees:

- a. Brian Ross[†] (EPA)
- b. Jorine Campopiano (EPA)
- c. Jack Gregg[†] (CCC)
- d. Dan Swenson (USACE-Regulatory)
- e. Corice Farrar (USACE-Regulatory)
- f. Antal Szijj[†] (USACE-Regulatory)
- g. Larry Smith (USACE-Planning)
- h. Bryant Chesney (NMFS)
- i. Barry Snyder[†] (AMEC)
- j. David Moore (Westin Solutions)
- k. Wendy Hovel (Anchor QEA)
- l. Theresa Stevens (USACE-Regulatory)
- m. Stuart Fricke (POLA-ENG)
- n. Kathryn Curtis (POLA-ENV)
- o. Angel Lim (POLA-ENG)
- p. Matt Arms (POLB)

[†] participating via teleconference.

II. Announcements:

- A. Larry Smith (USACE-PD): Marina del Rey sediment sampling will occur on June 7-8

III. CSTF Meetings:

A. Berths 167-169 Maintenance Dredging – SAP

a. Project proponent: POLA

b. Corps comments:

- i. POLA proposes dredging approximately 3000 cy of material from Berths 167-169 to 40 feet with and additional 2 feet of overdredge, Tier 2 testing on composite samples, and CDF (Berth 243-245) or Anchorage Road (upland) disposal. The POLA indicated the Berths 243-245 CDF is the preferred disposal location, with Anchorage Road upland disposal site as an alternative. The Corps agrees Tier 2 testing proposed in the

SAP and the proposed disposal sites are adequate because they have been previously authorized.

- ii. EPA indicated testing for PCB congeners was sufficient and that arachlor testing was not needed. The Corps agrees with this direction.
- iii. EPA recommended individual core chemical testing instead of composite testing because of 1999 PAH concentrations which were very high (order of magnitude differences) and highly variable among cores. Southern area (proposed cores 3, 4, 5) of most concern for “hot spots”. Okay to composite cores 1, 2. The Corps requests clarification from EPA on individual core testing rather than composite testing because no unconfined aquatic disposal is proposed, the Anchorage Road site would not result in return flow discharges, and the material tested in 1999 was removed.
- iv. POLA concerned individual core testing would be required of all future maintenance dredging actions. EPA indicated this is not the case. EPA concerned about revealing a more substantial contamination problem which could require remediation (I.e., the contamination source is deeper than previously known). The Corps is also concerned about a potential for contamination in the Port; however new dredging to increase depth beyond design depth at Berths 167-169 is not proposed. The Corps requests additional discussion with EPA and RWQCB on this issue.
- v. EPA recommended subsampling of “Z” layer (i.e., 6-inches below overdepth) in cores 3, 4, 5, and archiving for reference. If core refuses, then bottom-most part of the core would constitute the “Z” layer. The Corps agrees with this recommendation for testing at Berths 167-169 as it will help elucidate whether the contaminant problem is deeper than previously known.
- vi. RWQCB was not present but will be contacted to determine if there are any hazardous materials concerns even though PAH from 1999 was not detected above hazardous materials thresholds. The Corps will also follow up with the RWQCB regarding the potential “hot spot” issue raised by EPA above.
- vii. EPA Recommendations:
 1. Collect “Z” layer for all 5 cores. Archive “Z” layer for all cores.
 2. Complete individual PAH testing on cores 3, 4, 5 and “Z” layer, and composite testing for other chemicals on these cores and “Z” layer.
 3. Complete composite testing of chemicals on cores 1, 2.
 4. Complete individual core tests for DDT and metabolites on cores 1, 2.

IV. Project Review and Determinations

A. Maintenance Dredging for 43 Linda Isle – SAP

- a. **Project Proponent:** Orange County Investments, LLC
- b. **Corps comments:**
 - i. PCB congener analysis – EPA will follow up if requesting a different test be used.
 - ii. PCB congener analyte list – EPA found differences in the proposed list of PCB congeners to be analyzed and the list of 41 congeners the SC-DMMT has been using (list from the Bight Study) to gain consistency in sediment testing and monitoring in the region; EPA will provide Anchor QEA and the Corps Regulatory the list; Anchor QEA will then determine if their contract lab can perform the tests; further discussion may be necessary;
 - iii. Metals – EPA was concerned a different method should be used, but Anchor responded the proposed test would satisfy the need to determine if the contaminants would be below the ERL and the test EPA is requesting would be a higher cost. Anchor QEA suggested the SC-DMMT may want to adopt a similar approach that is used in San Francisco Bay where the DMMT has an absolute detection limit that must be met but that for contaminants of concern for bioaccumulation a recommendation or request for a lower detection limit is used. EPA will follow up with SC-DMMT and Anchor QEA on this matter after internal discussions.
 - iv. Sample locations - If possible, move one sample landward of the pierhead line. Anchor QEA will follow-up with feasibility of moving one sample location.
 - v. Pyrethroids – EPA and Corps Regulatory identified that pyrethroids are being added to the list of analytes. Anchor QEA questioned the relevance and feasibility requiring testing and analysis of a class of contaminants for which no standards for report limits or guidance for how to run the tests exists. Anchor QEA explained the analytical labs are inconsistent with reporting limits and not all labs have the capacity to run the tests in a manner to detect pyrethroids accurately. Anchor QEA recommended EPA contact SCCWRP to get information on the specific, proven methodology for how to run the tests properly so that the desired data of paired sediment and toxicity tests results are meaningful data. Anchor QEA advocated the

position that toxicity tests alone provide sufficient data to determine suitability of sediments for ocean disposal.

- vi. Eelgrass Bed – NMFS recommended Anchor QEA discuss further avoidance or set back near the eelgrass bed mapped in the northern part of the project site. NMFS cautioned that mitigation is very expensive and difficult to find. Corps Regulatory also explained that this SC-DMMT meeting is also somewhat of a pre-application meeting so that even though eelgrass isn't directly an issue of the SAP, it is good to have early feedback on the project. The Corps Regulatory and Planning relayed a recent experience to highlight the need for clarification of terms and expectations of avoidance where there was requirement for a setback to an eelgrass bed thought to be sufficient to avoid impact. However, the slope slumped and caused loss to the bed because the dredger interpreted the setback from the toe of the slope not the top of the slope.

c. EPA comments:

- i. Methodologies for testing - The Ocean Testing Manual recommends that MDLs should be lower than the appropriate values against which the data are to be compared for interpretation. The detection limits for an analyte should be no greater than one-third (one-half log unit) of the appropriate value for the analyte and matrix of concern. An MDL of one-fifth to one-tenth the appropriate value is desirable and sufficient in most cases. This is necessary to evaluate whether the concentration of the analyte is approaching the value critical to the decision-making process. The recommended methodologies that EPA proposed at the DMMT for both metals and PCBs have lower detection limits and better meet the OTM criteria. While analytical method 200.8, should satisfy our purposes, the reporting limit for PCBs with the methodology proposed (8082) exceeds EPA's performance standards. The ER-L for PCBs is 22.7 ppb, and with an RL for 1 ppb with 8082 for the 41 congeners, that is too high. We recommend method 8082A for PCB analysis, as it is both cost effective and achieves better reporting limits than method 8082. If there is an alternative testing methodology that meets our performance standard, EPA would be open to considering that as well. The congener list for the PCBs should also conform with the 41 congener list from SCCWRP (will send to consultant separately).

- ii. Pyrethroid Testing - Consistent with direction from Regional Board 8, the SAP should add pyrethroids to the list of analytes. Testing should include the analytes listed below.
- iii. Bioaccumulatives - Section 4 of the SAP states that tissues will be analysed for a subset of analytes based on sediment concentrations in exceedence of ERM thresholds. We request this is struck from the SAP. EPA will determine the analyte list based on those analytes that are both statistically significant from reference and known to bioaccumulate. Tables 9-5, and 9-6 in the ITM give us a good summary of those bioaccumulatives that are of concern (although this isn't an exhaustive list).

ANALYTE
 UNITS
 MDL
 RL

Bifenthrin
 ng/g ww
 0.500
 1.00

Cyfluthrin, total
 ng/g ww
 2.00
 4.00

Cypermethrin, total
 ng/g ww
 2.00
 4.00

Deltamethrin
 ng/g ww
 2.00
 4.00

Esfenvalerate/Fenvalerate, total
 ng/g ww
 1.00
 2.00

Fenpropathrin
 ng/g ww
 2.00
 4.00

Permethrin, cis
 ng/g ww
 4.00
 8.00

Permethrin, trans

ng/g ww

4.00

8.00

Warrior (Lambda Cyhalothrin), total

ng/g ww

1.00

2.00

Dibromooctafluorobiphenyl(Surrogate)

%

-88

-88

Dibutylchlorendate(Surrogate)

%

-88

-88

V. Presentations:

- A.** "Port of LA and LB toxic TMDLs and their effect on dredging projects" presented by Peter Kozelka (EPA).
- B.** "SPL Civil Works policy for beach nourishment grain size compatibility" presented by Jeffrey Devine (USACE-ED-Geotech).